

Craney Island Expansion Feasibility Study
Craney Island Alternatives Review Committee Meeting
Review of Footprint Options

January 8, 2001

Attendees:

Doug Martin	Project Manager
Larry Holland	H & H Technical Specialist
Peter Kube	Regulatory Technical Specialist
Helene Haluska	Social/Cultural Technical Specialist
Shana Heisey	Economic Technical Specialist
Tom Yancey	Senior Technical Reviewer
Joel Scussel	Craney Island Technical Specialist
Meade Stith	Craney Island Technical Specialist
Matt Byrne	GeoEnvironmental Technical Specialist
Michelle Banton	GIS technical Specialist
Craig Seltzer	Environmental Technical Specialist

Purpose of Meeting:

The purpose of the meeting was to select three footprint options to be included in the VIMS hydrodynamic modeling. Footprint Option 7 was previously selected as one of the four options to be modeled as it is identified as the locally preferred plan.

The committee set forth to select the three options from the 11 remaining footprint options. The goal of the committee was to select footprint options that would collectively represent modeling possibilities on all three sides of Craney Island. Such an effort would therefore provide a more complete picture as to the effect of any expansion of Craney Island on the surrounding environment.

Pete Kube presented the committee with a synopsis of suggested footprint options for modeling. The synopsis was a compilation of the locally preferred plan (option 7), two footprint options (option 6, option 9) that VDOT identified as “workable” with their proposed Alternate 9 [Third Harbor Crossing] and two possible westward footprint options(option 1, option 2), modified to reflect a northern port facility.

After much deliberation, the following options were selected for modeling:

<u>Option</u>	<u>Modification</u>	<u>Reason for selection</u>
7	No Modifications	Locally preferred plan.
5	Remove port facility & associated channel	Serve as base for comparison to the results of the other three models. Results can be “added” to results from Option 7 to summarize the possible effects of adding on an eastward port facility to the footprint.
6	No modifications	The results will show how a northward expansion will effect the flow and most importantly identify what effect, if any, a northward expansion would have on the “plunging front”.
9	Convert port facility on north levee to dredged material placement area. Remove associated channel and turning basin.	Determine cumulative effects of a northward and eastward expansion.